

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.PADMANABHAN NAIR

MONDAY, THE 9TH JULY 2007 / 18TH ASHADHA 1929

RP.No. 620 of 2007()

**-----
AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN LAA.517/2006 Dated 06/06/2007
-----**

: REVIEW PETITIONERS/APPELLANTS/CLAIMANTS

- 1. SREEDEVI WARASSIAR, PAINKULANGARA
WARRIATH, THATHAPPILLY.**
- 2. UNNIKRISHNAN, PAINKULANGARA WARRIATH,
THATHAPPILLY.**
- 3. SANTHOSH, PAINKULANGARA WARRIATH,
THATHAPPILLY.**
- 4. JAYASREE, PAINKULANGARA WARRIATH,
THATHAPPILLY.**
- 5. SREEHARI, PAINKULANGARA WARRIATH,
THATHAPPILLY.**

BY ADV. SRI.BIJU ABRAHAM

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT

**STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY THE
SPECIAL TAHSILDAR (LA), N.H.NO.IV,
NORTH PARAVUR.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.L.G.SURESH BABU

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 09/07/2007,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

K.PADMANABHAN NAIR, J

R.P. 620 of 2007

in

L.A.A 517 of 2006

Dated this the 9th day of July, 2007

ORDER

Heard counsel for the petitioner and the Government Pleader. For the reasons stated in the review petition I am of the view that the judgment passed by me on 6-6-2007 requires clarification.

2. The petitioner's land was acquired for a public purpose. Dissatisfied with the compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition Officer, he filed a petition claiming enhancement. The Land Acquisition Officer referred the case to Additional Sub-court, North Paravur, under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act. The court below awarded enhanced compensation. As per the decree interest was awarded on the compensation for injurious affection and solatium. Though interest was awarded as per the decree, the cheque application filed by the petitioner was dismissed on the ground that in the judgment no interest was awarded on those amounts. I disposed of the Land Acquisition Appeal holding that the petitioner is entitled to get interest on the amount awarded for injurious affection. But I did not consider whether the appellant is entitled to get interest on the solatium awarded. . So there is

R.P. 620 of 2007
in
L.A.A. 517 of 2006

-2-

an error apparent on the face of the record. So the judgment is to be reviewed.

3. In the result the judgment pronounced on 6-6-2007 is hereby reviewed. Post the L.A.A for hearing.

K.PADMANABHAN NAIR,JUDGE

es